

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-4 and 6-37 are pending in this application. Claims 1-4 and 6-35 stand rejected as unpatentable over US Patent no. 6,014,627 to Tougher et al. in view of US Patent No. 6,317,727 to May ("May") in view of US Patent No. 5,136,501 to Silverman and US Patent No. 6,035,287 to Stallaert. Claims 36 and 37 have been added. Claim 5 has been canceled.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the Interview conducted on October 16, 2003 and all the courtesies extended by the Examiner.

Applicant's claims have been amended to more clearly reflect the nature of the coupling between the credit limits associated with "buckets" (or maturity bands) of the financial instruments. Specifically, when a trade is made in a financial instrument having a tenor falling within bucket(x) (maturity band), it will effect the amount of available credit in that bucket(x), and proportionally effect the amount of available credit in other buckets which it has been coupled to.

This coupling is not taught in the prior art made of record. For example, May describes three screening methods: (a) a binary method in which each entity makes a yes or no determination as to whether or not it will deal with each potential counterparty; (b) a line binary or time limit method in which each entity sets a maximum maturity of contracts for each potential counterparty; and (c) a "complex" method in which each entity specifies a maximum amount it will trade with each counterparty for one or more "maturity bands." (See May col. 23, l. 65 – col. 24, l. 33) Under the "complex" method the entity can specify the maximum exposure for each maturity band. (See May col. 24, ll. 34-44) For example, an entity could specify that for a given counterparty, it "will do up to \$100 million out for 5 years, and then only \$50 million out from thereafter out to 10 years, and nothing thereafter." (See May col. 24, ll. 42-44) However, the credit limits for each of the maturity bands under May's "complex" method are not coupled. Accordingly, trades with tenors falling within one band, do not effect the amount of available credit in other bands. Thus, for the above cited example from the May specification, the parties could do the full \$100 million credit limit for the lower band (*i.e.* up to 5 years) without affecting the amount they could do (*i.e.* \$50 million) in the next band (*i.e.* over 5 years to 10 years).

Neither May, nor Tougher, nor Silverman teach or disclose any method or system for relating credit limits between buckets (or maturity bands) as required by each of the independent claims (claims 1, 10, 29, 30 and 33). Accordingly, independent claims 1, 29, 30 and 33 are believed patentable over the prior art of record.

In view of the forgoing supporting remarks, Applicant respectfully request allowance of claims 1-4 and 6-37.

If the Examiner wishes to direct any questions concerning this application to the undersigned Applicant's representative, please call the number indicated below

Respectfully submitted,

Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP

By 

Andrew F. Strobert Reg. No. 35,375
Guy Perry Reg. No. 46,194
Tel.: 212-735-3000